



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# EMPLOYEES' REPRESENTATION IN MANAGEMENT OF INDUSTRY

BY ROYAL MEEKER

*U. S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics*

The multitude of causes making for the general dissatisfaction prevailing among workers which is called industrial unrest, may be compressed under three heads: (1) Dissatisfaction with their wages, hours, and earnings. A feeling on the part of the workers that they are not receiving a fair share of the product of industry. A widespread belief that workers are being exploited by owners, employers, and their managers. The rapid rise in prices has greatly strengthened this belief even among those workers who have secured wage increases in excess of increases in the cost of living. Many thousands of workmen who have profited greatly by the price upheavals of the war period, firmly believe they are worse off than before the war, or at least that the employers have gained more than the workmen and hence the workmen are being done by the employers. (2) Dissatisfaction with the management of industry. A feeling that not only are the workers being exploited but that the "enterprisers" are not as enterprising and their managers not as capable as has been commonly supposed. Work is made needlessly monotonous and uninteresting and production is thereby curtailed. The workers feel that industries are being conducted from a distance by men who have little or no first hand knowledge of conditions and who do not understand the workers' point of view, knowledge, and capacity. These grievances are due in larger part to big business organization which has brought about what may justly be called "absentee landlordism" in industry. (3) Dissatisfaction with the nature of their work. A feeling that industry is a treadmill for workers of all kinds, but especially for manual workers, and that the opportunities of successful and permanent escape into managerial, employing, and capitalistic positions are scarce and growing scarcer every day.

Through collective bargaining workers have long exercised a greater or less degree of control over wages, hours, and conditions of labor. During the war the principle of collective bargaining was of necessity, albeit in many cases rather grudgingly, recognized by all employers engaged on direct government work or in the production of essentials. The Quartermasters Corps, the Ordnance Office, the Emergency Fleet Corporation of the Shipping Board, the National War Labor Board,

the Fuel Administration, and many other government agencies, sought to secure greater and more continuous production by means of collective agreements covering wages and hours and by establishing committees to represent the workers in dealing with the management on shop conditions. Since the signing of the armistice, government control over industry has been either abandoned or greatly relaxed and industrial warfare has grown more extensive and more bitter. The elephantine governmental machines built and set up to adjust labor disputes were clumsy and cumbersome, and oftentimes worked against each other so that a labor adjustment made by one agency produced labor maladjustment in all other fields. Each agency dealing with labor was a law unto itself. The terms coöperation, coördination, and correlation were heard on every hand until they became a weariness to the flesh, but the labor adjusters seldom were able to coöperate, coördinate, or correlate anything. I do not say this in the spirit of caviling criticism. No one is to be blamed. On the contrary, great praise is due to those who, in spite of constitutional inhibitions and public indifference, succeeded in partially organizing our industrial chaos. It is greatly to be regretted that these men were not able to formulate a national labor policy for war to be continued in peace. Probably if the war had continued four more years a national labor policy must have been worked out, with the administration centered in one national Industrial Commission or in a series of commissions, one for each industry. Numerous district boards to take care of local disputes would have been necessary under either system. Of course, no one would be willing to have the war prolonged for four days, even to secure such a highly desirable result as the establishment of a national system of adjusting labor grievances and determining industrial policies on a democratic basis. We can only hope that the terrors of peace will be as potent as the horrors of war in compelling the Bolsheviki of the right and of the left to come together on a reasonable compromise.

Absentee landlordism is as bad in the field of economics as in the field of politics. Labor unrest in the present-day meaning of the term is a natural and inevitable result of the industrial revolution, machine production, absentee ownership of industrial establishments, and the centering of industrial management in the hands of managers of finance whose offices are in the big banks and office buildings of the centers of finance and trade. Strikes in the modern sense were practically unknown until industrial units had grown to such a size as to erect formidable barriers between the workers on the one side and the responsible owners and managers on the other. The spirit of antago-

nism against the absentee ownership of farms in Kansas and Nebraska and other Northwestern states, which culminated in the Farmers' Alliance and Populist movements, manifests itself today against the absentee owners of industry.

Lack of interest in work grows out of absentee ownership. The absent industrial landlords, interested only or principally in dividends, employed experts, scientific managers, to produce a substitute for the old-time workman's interest in his work. The scientific managers have been attacked so violently and so frequently that I feel obliged to apologize for referring at this point to the most obvious and fundamental error contained in their original program. The scientific managers did not, in the beginning of the efficiency movement, differentiate between the workman and the machine or tool with which he worked. Men and machines were to be made to do each operation the "easiest" way, that is, with the least lost motion and expenditure of effort. The scientific managers have not yet grasped fully the difference between a man and a machine and the economy of making use of the heads of the workers as well as their arms and legs. A good deal is said about the worker's psychology, as though the worker were some strange wild beast with a peculiar psychology all his own, quite different from the psychology of employers and managers. It is because the psychology of the worker is the same as the psychology of the employer and the manager that strikes and lockouts occur with such distressing frequency.

If we grant that a works manager has more brains and knowledge than any of the employees under his direction, he should be able to organize and plan the work so that if the workmen, instead of following their own devices, follow the plan laid out, the output would be bettered both in quantity and quality while the physical energy expended to attain this output would be lessened. The theoretical ideal of maximum output with minimum expenditure of effort which can be figured out by mathematical formulae and pictured on charts, is never attained in practice. A much more imperfect layout, which leaves much to the ingenuity and initiative of the individual workmen, in practice almost always achieves much better results. A man will willingly work much harder, expend much more energy, and be much less fatigued working on a job which he has a part in planning, and for the results of which he is responsible. The present-day movement for industrial democracy is a partial recognition of the fundamental psychological phenomenon that industrial fatigue is not simply an engineering question to be stated mathematically in foot pounds per hour

or even a physiological question having to do with calories burned up in the body. Work is hard primarily because it is uninteresting and monotonous, or easy because it demands ingenuity or skill. Paradoxical as it seems, the way to make work easier is to make it harder by requiring more of the workmen. The mental application required or the muscular effort put forth has little to do with the hardness of a job. In so far as scientific management has resulted in merely breaking processes up into their component parts, segregating so far as possible the purely muscular and mechanical operations from the creative and planning functions, so-called "efficiency" has resulted in the most disastrous inefficiency. The "easier" specific operations or fractions of operations have been made, the harder they have become. All the efforts of the scientific managers and efficiency experts to arouse, increase, and maintain the interest of the workman in his work are bound to be fruitless unless the work itself is made interesting. The worker must be called upon to use his head in planning as well as his hands and feet in executing his work, if contentment is to be attained in industry.

During the war the scarcity of workers and the need to increase output of essentials gave the workers great power. Private employers and governments were obliged to give more consideration to the rights and desires of laborers than was ever given before. The fear that employees might use their vastly increased power to seize political control and perhaps revolutionize and even socialize industry and private property led private employers the world over to experiment with different plans for participation by employees, to some degree, in the "management of industry." The governments of the world, recognizing the seriousness of the labor unrest, have tried to guide and control the efforts of the workers to secure more power in the planning and carrying out of industrial policies. Great Britain has been experimenting with the Whitley system of organizing industries into national and district joint industrial councils and works committees. National joint industrial councils have been set up in some fifty industries, besides the councils established in the government departments for both manual and clerical employees. It must not be assumed that these industries are fully organized under the so-called Whitley system, and that all industrial unrest has become a thing of the past. In fact the national joint industrial councils are analogous to the roof of a house suspended in mid air with no supporting side walls or foundations upon which to rest. Speakers and writers are wont to refer glibly to the "solution" of labor unrest worked out and put into practice in Great Britain. The

facts are that only three industries have set up complete "Whitley systems" of joint industrial representation of employers and employees with a national council and district councils for the industry and works committees for individual shops, and these three industries are relatively insignificant; namely, match, rubber, and pottery manufacturing. I am told that there are only two match factories in Great Britain. Rubber manufacture increased in importance during the war. Pottery is of far more importance than the other two industries, but does not rank with the great basic industries of Great Britain. Even in the three fully organized industries, the organization is almost purely formal, being for the most part a paper organization. It must not be assumed that this interesting attempt to make industrial management more democratic has failed. It is merely in the experimental stage. The system has not been accepted by either employees or employers generally. It must not be too hastily assumed that Great Britain has discovered a magic formula for "solving" all industrial unrest. It might seem from the wildly exaggerated accounts which have appeared in some quarters that the eager industrial alchemists in Great Britain, seeking after the industrial philosopher's stone, have found instead the Blarney stone! The search has, however, only just begun and what if anything will be found cannot yet be foretold. The experts in the division of the Ministry of Labor which is dealing with these industrial councils, holding meetings with employers and employees constantly, and setting up new national industrial councils about every week, do not proclaim that industrial democracy has been achieved and labor unrest solved by the organization of national councils. Everything is still in the experimental stage, with a strong probability that the first experiments will be, at best, only partially successful and that only by trial and error after many experiments will a solid basis of settlement be reached.

It was my good fortune to be present at the first Industrial Conference called by Premier Lloyd George which met in London, February 27 of this year. That was a most impressive assemblage, and it transacted an amazing amount of business in its lifetime of one day, especially as the whole forenoon was given up to an oratorical Donnybrook fair in which everybody took a crack at the Premier's head, while he sat by and really seemed to enjoy the proceedings. As a result of this first Conference a joint committee consisting of thirty representatives of employers and thirty representatives of employees was appointed. This committee reported on April 4, recommending the establishment of a permanent Industrial Conference, made up of

representatives of employers and employees, to meet annually or at the call of the government and to advise the government in matters of industrial policy. It was intended to be a sort of Industrial Parliament or Advisory Council. Its recommendations will have no binding force, but they may and probably will be very illuminating and helpful to the political government. This extra-legal Industrial Parliament is merely another industrial experiment. It may eventually help to solve the problem of industrial unrest, but it hasn't done so yet. The four biggest trade union organizations have refused, or at least have refrained from, sending representatives to the Permanent Industrial Conference, namely, the Textile Workers, the Engineering Trades, the National Union of Railwaymen, and the General Workers' Union. The employers who deal with these union men are also holding aloof.

In our own country as contrasted with Great Britain, nothing so ambitious nor so well thought out has been tried. During the war numerous "shop committees," giving a measure of representation to the workers, were set up in many establishments, but no permanent nation-wide organization was created to tie these shop committees into a system, unless perhaps the Shipping Board and the Railroad Administration may be spoken of as permanent bodies.

The plans to bring the employees into closer relations with their employers by means of "shop stewards," "shop committees," "works councils," or other means is often hailed as the dawn of a new democracy in industry. It is new as compared with ten years ago or even five years ago; but it can not be too emphatically stated that democracy in industry is not a discovery of the great world war. In fact, with all the shop committees and works councils of today, we have much less democracy in industry than obtained forty years ago or even in the Middle Ages, or at any time before the introduction of power-driven machinery with its tendency to segregate the employers and managers from their employees. The shop committee is the present-day attempt to restore some of the democracy lost through machine industry and big business. While it is, of course, impossible that there can ever be as complete democracy in a large plant as in a small plant, it is often true that the workers' committees of the large plants are able to secure better conditions and more consideration for the workers than the workers are able to secure for themselves in the smaller plants.

The different types of shop committees and works councils in this country which I have been able to examine may be divided into three

pretty distinct groups, namely: (1) Closed Shop Committees of union workmen chosen exclusively by union men affiliated with national or international unions; (2) Open Shop Committees composed of workers chosen by the votes of all workers who have been employed in the shop the required period of time; (3) Open-Closed Shop Committees chosen by all workers qualified to vote in a shop that is closed against trade unions and which may or may not have a local plant or corporation organization of the workers. There is a monotonous sameness in the constitutions and by-laws or plans of organization within each of these three groups. There is in fact little fundamental variation in the published statements of the objects sought and the plans of organization as between group and group. This sameness in descriptive language makes tabulation of the hundreds of shop committee plans easy and the results of such tabulation perfectly useless or rather utterly misleading. I have, therefore, made no attempt to enumerate the different kinds of shop committees as to their attitude toward trade unions. Each plan and even each shop committee must be studied in order to find out just how democratic it is and whether it is working as the employers and managers say it is. The trade unions naturally enough want all shop committees to be tied up to the national craft organizations. The huge majority of employers in this country are, and always have been, opposed to labor organizations. The President's first Industrial Conference came to a deadlock on the question of the right of employees to organize and to choose representatives to deal with the management. The employer group in the Conference must be taken as representing the majority of employers the country over. The speeches made by these representative employers were often difficult to understand, but their attitude of mind was never for a moment in doubt. They had been driven by hard experience to abandon individual bargaining with each employee and to accept collective bargaining, but they vigorously maintained their right to dictate the terms of the collective bargain. These employers conceded the right of workers to organize in a given plant and to be represented by representatives chosen from among the employees of that plant, provided the representatives so chosen were agreeable to the management of said plant. The trade unionists on the other hand insisted upon the right of the workers to choose the representatives whom they thought could best speak for them and make clear their needs and wishes.

It is interesting to note that, respecting labor organization, the position of organized employers and employees is exactly reversed in Great



Britain as compared with the United States. We are today exactly where the British were about thirty years ago. The question of national unions versus plant unions was fought out in Great Britain and won by the workers. British employers were obliged to accept the result and bargained collectively with the representatives of the national unions. During the war the workers rebelled against this system, insisting that wages, hours, and shop conditions should be negotiated for each shop by the local shop committees. The employers stood up valiantly for the established order, and insisted that they would have nothing to do with local shop committees, but would bargain collectively only with truly responsible and representative bodies, the executives of the national trade unions. American employers, equally valiant for the established order, will have nothing to do with irresponsible, unrepresentative officials of national trade unions and insist on bargaining collectively with representatives of the workers who know the local situation and who are chosen from the shop where a dispute is pending, provided always that these worker representatives fulfill the employers' ideas of a bona fide representative. One of the biggest questions to be settled is whether employees' representation is to be local and under the direct control and domination of the employer, or whether it is to be nation or world wide and under the control of the workers themselves, or whether the general public will insist on being a party to every collective agreement so as to prevent the employers and the employees from agreeing too agreeably and charging the bill to the ultimate consumer.

As to function, most shop committees deal with grievances, working conditions (*i.e.* safety, sanitation, and hygiene), wages and hours of labor, and methods of wage payments. Oftentimes a different shop committee is created to deal with each separate function coming under the general head of industrial relations. As to participation in management of industry in the true sense of the term, there is as yet practically none in the United States. A great many general managers and directors of personnel say the employees have been taken into partnership and are taking part in the management of the business like true industrial democrats. No doubt these managers and directors honestly think they have achieved industrial democracy; but in the systems of employee representation which I have been able to examine, the still small voice of the General Manager could be heard very, very distinctly above the roar of the shop committee whirlwind or the crash of the works council earthquake. I do not say that the existing shop committees have done nothing to democratize industry. They have

and they are, in my opinion, to be heartily commended and given every encouragement. As indicated above, a few establishments have progressed to the point where the employees' voices do have some weight in determining policies and methods and in planning work.

As to the method by which representatives of workers are chosen to the shop committees, there are almost as many different plans as there are different plants having such plans. The plan by which representation or participation of the employees is secured is of little importance compared to the scope of the functions which the committees or representatives of the workers are permitted or are able to exercise.

A bigger question even than that of how collective bargains are to be made and who are to be parties thereto is the question of the scope and content of the collective bargain itself. The radical trade unionists of Great Britain, and to a much less extent of the United States, are insisting that the workers shall take a larger and larger share in management, until ultimately all or at least the more important industries shall be conducted by the workers. A few interesting experiments in employees' management are already being tried out in Great Britain,—for example, the John Dawson works at Newcastle-on-Tyne, under the managership of Mr. Leonard Humphrey. Mr. Humphrey started with nothing and built up a very profitable aeroplane factory during the war. He is or was, when I interviewed him, the managing director of the John Dawson Company. The company consisted of all the employees of the factory. The books of the company are open to the representatives of the employees so that they know at all times the costs of raw materials, machines, tools, and labor, the allowance for depreciation and obsolescence, and the selling price of the finished products. The workers own collectively 50 per cent of the stock of the company; the other 50 per cent is owned by Mr. Humphrey. While the workers can not therefore fire Mr. Humphrey if they should become dissatisfied with him, still they could break up the company. They had no desire to do so when I was in England, because they felt that they really were helping to manage a very successful enterprise, and that Mr. Humphrey was the best manager obtainable. During the war Mr. Humphrey paid wages above the scale for all trades employed in the John Dawson factory. The working day was reduced, if I remember correctly, to eight hours per day and forty-four hours per week. Mr. Humphrey said production per day and per week had increased remarkably, and it was his intention to reduce the working day to six hours. After the signing of the armistice the factory took up the manufacture of high grade furniture and

pianos in addition to the manufacture of aeroplanes for commercial uses. This factory is one of the few bona fide experiments in industrial democracy.

Several obvious criticisms will at once come into the minds of all. First, John Dawson was a war baby, and granting that industrial democracy may be a fine pabulum for war babies, it may disagree with peace babies. This may well be. Many experiments can be safely made with a super-prosperous enterprise that would result fatally with a minimum-of-subsistence enterprise. Again, the class of workers attracted by the high wages paid at the John Dawson works was no doubt much above the average. While an industrial democracy might be conducted by these picked, intelligent men, it might fail if it fell into the hands of the ordinary average workmen. If every employer started to John Dawsonize, the result might be industrial chaos as bad or worse than that we experienced as a result of the cost-plus contracts for building cantonments, ships, factories, uniforms, and other things.

Of all the many hundreds of systems of "industrial democracy" which I have studied, very few give promise of accomplishing much in the way of winning the enthusiastic support of the workers, because little, if any, additional authority over or responsibility for methods and results is accorded them. In the great majority of plans, the workers are permitted only to participate in managing, under safeguards and direction or at least suggestion from above, matters of safety, sanitation, benefit funds, and other "welfare" activities. No eager enthusiastic response from the workers can be expected from such ultra-conservative adventures in industrial radicalism. I do not mean that these plans are, in the great majority of cases, insincere schemes intended to deceive the worker into thinking he is being taken into partnership when he is really only being "taken in." Nothing of the sort. I think employers in general sincerely desire to make concessions to labor. Of course, they want to concede as little as is absolutely necessary to prevent the spread of those radical things with the fearsome Russian names. Perhaps as time goes by the workers will be given the opportunity to demonstrate that they are worthy of greater responsibilities and capable of more constructive contributions to industrial management. None of the shop committees and works councils has been operating long enough to warrant generalizations about future developments. As a worker and a student I feel that there is a tremendous latent creative force in the workers of today which is not being utilized at all. This force may be likened to the

force of the waves and the tides of the ocean. No engineer has as yet been able to devise a practical method for utilizing the giant strength of the sea; but every industrial engineer with any imagination whatsoever dreams of the day when this giant will be harnessed and made to do the work of the world. Perhaps it is not and never will be economically feasible to harness the sea. It is likewise possible that human nature is fundamentally so constituted that it never will be practicable to utilize the good will, enthusiasm, and creative power of the workers—to substitute leadership for drivership in industry. It may be that industrial peace on earth is unattainable, and that industrial war is the natural state of man; but I do not believe it. Anyhow, it is worth a thorough trial in order to find out whether the workers, if given responsibility in industrial management, will become so interested in their work that they won't have time to be restless.

During and immediately after the war, employers were alarmed at the thought of the power of the radical labor movement. The collapse of the railway strike in Great Britain and the failure of the British miners to win out on the nationalization of the coal mines have greatly cheered employers everywhere. The relative industrial calm in France, Belgium, and Germany also has had a marked effect. In our own country the longshoremen's strike, the printers' strike, the steel workers' strike, and the coal miners' strike have greatly weakened the influence of the radical laborite and socialist leaders, while they certainly have not strengthened the conservative trade unionists. I think it is perfectly obvious that the wild stampede on the part of employers to set up "shop committees" and "works councils" and to proclaim the dawn of the new day of "Industrial Democracy" is over. From now on few new plans will be set up. Probably many plans already created will be abandoned or allowed to perish by atrophy. The sincere attempts to enlist the sympathy and help of the workers in bringing about industrial peace, however, will continue and will be gradually perfected.

I am not much interested in the possibility of the workers owning, managing, and operating all industries or even the more important ones. At the present moment we are not in sight of that consummation. It must be conceded that the worker who has served long enough in a plant to have acquired a special skill in doing his work, even if it is only shoveling slag or wheeling a barrow, has invested something in that industry and that plant, and that he has thereby acquired a right to have his views as to the conditions surrounding his job considered by the management. A means should be provided whereby he may present any grievance or any suggestion he may have to make to

somebody representing the management. He may get turned down. None of us ever gets all he wants or asks for. But every worker ought to have the right to give his views on industrial matters just as he has the right to express his views on political or religious matters. The workers will not be satisfied merely to express views. They want the assurance that their views will be given more than a perfunctory consideration. No class of people is more responsive to fair, open-handed dealing than the workers. If their proposals are discussed openly with them and shown to be impracticable, or inexpedient for the time, they have, almost invariably, been quite ready to vote for the rejection of their own proposals.

There is a vast gulf fixed between expressing an opinion about the shape of the handle of the shovel one uses for heaving slag or the desirability of having a glee club rather than a debating society, and the planning and routing of work, devising methods and determining upon the tools, machines, and processes for making the finished product in a big plant. I insist that the management, even scientific management, has not a monopoly of all the brains in an establishment. The workers themselves can and do contribute much in the planning and doing of the work. What is of vastly more importance than the increase in production as a result of utilizing the latent intelligence, ingenuity, and enthusiasm of the workers, is the increase in contentment. Here is a vast source of industrial power which has been cut off, isolated by the transformation of little business into big business. It will be difficult to tap this source, but tap it we must if we are to continue anything resembling the present industrial organization with its large scale production. The good will of the workers is a much more potent force making for industrial efficiency than all the scientific management formulas and systems of production. There is no inherent reason why the good will of the workers should not go hand in hand with scientific management. Until now the workers have had only antagonism for scientific management because the scientific manager never asked them for their opinions or ideas,—he only told them what they were expected to do and the workers promptly did something else. I have already said workers are not different from employers. That is precisely what ails them. If employers will deal fairly and squarely with their employees, let them know all about the business except only those technical processes which must be kept secret, and take them into a real partnership, production will be enormously improved both in quantity and quality. This may be just another way of saying that when the millennium comes there will be no

industrial unrest for there will be no industry, no employers, and no employees. Before abandoning ourselves completely to pessimism and despair we should at least try the experiment of giving the workers a real voice and responsibility in management.

In all discussions of employees' representation too much emphasis is placed on production and not enough on distribution and consumption of the product. The interest of the worker in increasing production is bound to wane, no matter how many representatives he may have on shop committees and works councils, no matter how much dependence is placed upon him in planning and carrying out his work, if in the division of the product he does not get or believes he does not get his fair share. The share due to labor as a whole and to each individual laborer is impossible of exact determination. The concept of economic law as a force, as compelling, as universal, as immutable, and as unerring as the law of gravitation, is beautiful but it doesn't get us anywhere. If there is an economic law working uninterruptedly to adjust the economic reward of each member of society in accordance with his economic merit, or, in other words, in proportion to his contribution to the economic product, it remains hidden beyond the ken of the labor statistician and administrator. Practically the share of labor is determined by the bargaining strength of the workers.

Of course, if the workers are to be admitted to participation in management, they must participate to some extent in the losses as well as the gains of industry. A practical method of payment would be to guarantee for each position a minimum wage which must be paid regardless of any losses which the business may suffer. In addition to the minimum, a bonus should be provided varying according to the contribution of the workers in cutting down labor costs, in reducing costs of management, in decreasing spoilage of material, in decreasing wear and tear on machines and tools, in improving quality of product, in increasing business or in any other way. This would obviate the objection to most bonus schemes that the worker is penalized or rewarded for the inefficiency or the good judgment of the managers.

Democracy, if it is not to perish from the earth, must be organized for efficiency. It must become far more efficient than it ever has been at any time in the past. We are told that democracy has just won a tremendous victory over autocracy. Our rejoicings must be tempered by the remembrance of the awful cost of the victory in lives shattered and snuffed out, in wealth squandered and destroyed, in the chaos which has been unloosed on the earth. When we count up the costs we do not feel too confident of the fullness of this victory nor too secure in

its beneficent results. The victors suffered far greater losses both in men and in material wealth than the vanquished. Democracy won by sheer weight of numbers and of wealth. Had not autocracy been divided against itself it could not have been overthrown by the partial and inefficient democracies which opposed it. In order to win, democracy was driven to adopt autocratic methods and practices,—methods and practices which still persist and fill democrats with apprehension. A speedy readjustment, political and industrial, on a more democratic basis is necessary. The few feeble, tottering steps which we have taken on the road toward democracy, both political and industrial, will not and can not be retraced. The evils, shortcomings, and imperfections of our present democracy can not be eradicated by reverting to autocracy which we have in part shaken off. The cure for democracy is more not less democracy.